

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

In re: BAIR HUGGER FORCED AIR
WARMING DEVICES PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 15-2666 (JNE/DTS)
ORDER

This Document Relates to:
All Actions

The parties filed a Joint Motion Regarding Continued Sealing. *See* LR 5.6(d)(2).

In an Order dated July 17, 2020, the Honorable David T. Schultz, United States Magistrate Judge, granted the motion in part, directed the Clerk of Court to keep certain documents sealed and to unseal other documents, and granted Plaintiffs 28 days to file public versions of certain documents with redactions. Plaintiffs objected to the July 17 Order. Defendants responded. The Court declines to consider Plaintiffs' objection.

“Within 21 days after the filing of the final memorandum authorized by LR 7.1 . . . in connection with the underlying motion . . . , the parties must file a completed Joint Motion Regarding Continued Sealing Form.” LR 5.6(d)(2). “The magistrate judge will ordinarily rule on the joint motion without oral argument. A party . . . who objects to the order must file a motion for further consideration under LR 5.6(d)(3).” LR 5.6(d)(2)(C). “Within 28 days after entry of the magistrate judge’s order disposing of a joint motion regarding continued sealing under LR 5.6(d)(2), a party . . . may file a motion for further consideration by the magistrate judge.” LR 5.6(d)(3). “A party . . . may object to a magistrate judge’s order disposing of a motion for further consideration of sealing, but

only if that party . . . filed or opposed the motion. The objection is governed by LR 72.2(a).” LR 5.6(d)(4).

Plaintiffs objected to the July 17 Order, which granted in part the parties’ Joint Motion Regarding Continued Sealing. Plaintiffs did not file a motion for further consideration of sealing by the magistrate judge. Accordingly, the Court declines to consider Plaintiff’s objection. *See* LR 5.6 Advisory Committee Note (2017) (“No party . . . may ask the district judge to review the magistrate judge’s order [ruling on the joint motion]. Instead, a party . . . who objects to the order must first file a motion for further consideration under LR 5.6(d)(3). An order disposing of a motion for further consideration is reviewable by the district judge.”).

Based on the files, records, and proceedings herein, and for the reasons stated above, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Clerk of Court shall terminate Docket No. 2147.

Dated: August 26, 2020

s/ Joan N. Ericksen
JOAN N. ERICKSEN
United States District Judge